

*** NOTE: TO RETURN TO THIS PAGE, CLICK ON THE COUNTY SEAL ***

[CLICK HERE FOR AUDITOR-CONTROLLER's REPORT DATED NOVEMBER 1, 2007](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR THE CEO's REPORT DATED SEPTEMBER 25, 2008](#)



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2706
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

J. TYLER McCAULEY
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

WENDY L. WATANABE
CHIEF DEPUTY

November 1, 2007

TO: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

FROM: J. Tyler McCauley 
Auditor-Controller

**SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP REVIEW OF COUNTY COUNSEL LITIGATION COST
MANAGEMENT – RESPONSE TO COUNTY COUNSEL’S RESPONSE**

On October 5, 2007, we issued our report on County Counsel's progress in implementing ten recommendations from our January 29, 2007 report. We reviewed recommendations that County Counsel indicated in their March 23, 2007 response, and in subsequent communications, that they had implemented. We did not review the remaining 26 recommendations at this time. We will follow-up on County Counsel's compliance with these recommendations in subsequent reviews.

Of the ten recommendations reviewed, we noted County Counsel had fully implemented five and substantially or partially implemented the other five recommendations. County Counsel's response dated October 12, 2007 indicates that County Counsel believes they have fully implemented all ten recommendations. On October 16, 2007, the Board directed the Auditor-Controller to report on recommendations for which County Counsel disagrees with the reported implementation status.

It should be noted that most of our recommendation follow-up fieldwork was completed prior to August 2007. Due to the number of significant steps County Counsel has taken to implement the recommendations, we believe that the five recommendations which we determined have not been fully implemented will require minimum effort from County Counsel to achieve an Implemented status. It is conceivable that subsequent to the end of our fieldwork, most of these five recommendations are now fully implemented. We

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

will again review the status of these five recommendations within the next six months. Following is a discussion on these recommendations.

Recommendation 1 from the January 29, 2007 Report

County Counsel management monitor to ensure initial CEPs are completed in a timely manner, include all required information, and are properly approved.

Current Status: SUBSTANTIALLY IMPLEMENTED

County Counsel's Response

County Counsel's response indicates that they believe our conclusion that the recommendation is only substantially implemented is based, in part, on a new recommendation that we made in our follow-up report, not on the original recommendation which dealt with monitoring Case Evaluation Plans (CEPs) to ensure the CEPs were completed timely, included all required information, and were properly approved. County Counsel also stated that our conclusion is based on a former monitoring process that has since been replaced, and that they gave us evidence that the CEP we say was not signed was approved in a RMIS note.

County Counsel also states that they are using multiple methods to monitor CEPs, including: 1) using a revised spreadsheet to log-in and track CEPs; 2) maintaining and reviewing duplicate monitoring files; 3) sending "reminder e-mails" to attorneys, Third Party Administrators (TPA) and outside counsel in advance of due dates and "follow-up" e-mails if any requirements have not been met; 4) including CEP information in roundtable scheduling notices; 5) inputting the CEP data into RMIS; and, 6) scanning and attaching CEPs into RMIS. County Counsel states these procedures demonstrate that they have fully complied with the recommendation to monitor CEP compliance.

Auditor's Response

We recognize that County Counsel made a significant effort to implement this recommendation and agree the procedures or processes they implemented contributed to their significant improvement in monitoring CEPs. That is why we classified this recommendation as Substantially Implemented.

However, County Counsel's response does not address the key reason the recommendation was not classified as Implemented. Our conclusion that the recommendation was Substantially Implemented was not related to the new recommendation regarding approval of CEPs for cases handled in-house as indicated by County Counsel on their response. Our conclusion was based on audit test results

which showed untimely CEPs, undocumented CEP approval and inconsistent CEP monitoring at the time of our fieldwork as described below:

- Two CEPs were submitted late (i.e., an average of 29 days beyond the due dates, which were 75 days and 90 days from the date assigned).
- One CEP was not signed by the TPA to indicate approval. The RMIS note to which County Counsel's response refers indicates the TPA received the CEP and increased case reserves, but does not indicate approval. The TPA's contract states that the TPA must submit approved CEPs to County Counsel, and the TPA's procedure manual indicates that the TPA should sign the CEP to indicate approval. In fact, we noted in a few instances that County Counsel is encouraging and reminding staff to obtain approving signatures on CEPs, including CEPs approved by TPAs.
- The monitoring system in place at the time of our review was not consistently used. We noted and considered the various monitoring mechanisms that County Counsel lists in their response. However, while these are positive steps, not all these steps were being consistently performed. The spreadsheet that County Counsel uses to track CEPs was not consistently updated and was not being used to follow up on late or missing CEPs. We noted County Counsel is sending follow-up emails and reminding staff of late or missing CEPs. These reminders were sent in July and August 2007, after we brought this issue to their attention.

To ensure full implementation of this recommendation, County Counsel management needs to ensure all their multiple monitoring efforts are consistently applied, including submitting approved CEPs timely.

Recommendation 7 from the January 29, 2007 Report

County Counsel management ensure that cost-benefit analyses are completed and documented in CEPs and roundtable discussions.

Current Status: PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED

County Counsel's Response

County Counsel states that the elements of a cost-benefit analysis are broader than our report indicates, and indicates we are substituting our judgment for counsel's legal opinion of appropriate litigation strategy. County Counsel also indicates they disagree that CEPs lack the required information just because the attorneys preparing them wrote that it was "premature to assess" liability or the information requested was "unknown at this time."

Auditor's Response

We did not evaluate proposed litigation strategy, nor did we express any opinion on the appropriateness of the decision to defend or settle a case. Our issue was strictly one of documentation.

We agree that there are numerous factors that need to be considered in formulating litigation strategy. Our reason for classifying this recommendation as Partially Implemented is that the case files (including CEPs and roundtable notes) do not always explain how the decision to defend or settle a case was reached. In their response, County Counsel gives specific details about why a litigation strategy was appropriate. However, these details were not included in the CEPs and/or roundtable notes we reviewed.

In addition, we did not find fault just because attorneys indicated that it was premature to assess certain information or that the information was unknown at the time the CEP was prepared. The cases we cited as exceptions were those where cost information was available but not included in the CEP or roundtable notes and those where cost information was included in the CEP but there was no evidence showing how County Counsel arrived at the decision to defend or settle the case based on the cost information provided. This is not to say cost-benefit analyses were not considered, but there was no documentation or evidence on how the decision was reached.

County Counsel can quickly move this recommendation to Implemented status by better documenting cost-benefit information and conclusions reached.

Recommendation 2 from the October 5, 2007 report

County Counsel revise their procedures to require attorneys to prepare/update a cost-benefit analysis for each case and review these analyses at the quarterly roundtables or similar forums.

County Counsel's Response

County Counsel disagrees with our new recommendation. They say we are requiring them to have substantive (or case specific) quarterly roundtables for all cases. County Counsel's response also states that the outside consultant's report recommends that cost-benefit analyses are best done closer to a mediation date or about two months before trial.

Auditor's Response

The intent of our recommendation is to ensure all cases have cost-benefit analyses prepared/updated and that the analyses are reviewed on a regular basis. The fact that we recommend that County Counsel needs to review these cost-benefit analyses at the "quarterly roundtables or similar forums" indicates that it is up to County Counsel management's discretion to determine if they will do this through quarterly roundtables or another mechanism.

During our follow-up, we noted that cost-benefit analyses may not be performed or updated for every case. For example, cost benefit analyses are required in CEPs, which are prepared early in a case and whenever legal fees and costs exceed prior estimates, and at six-month roundtables. However, six-month roundtables are only required if a case is initially budgeted for \$100,000. As a result, if the initial CEP is prepared before the cost benefit information is known, and the case is budgeted below \$100,000, a cost benefit analysis may not be prepared until (or if) a revised CEP is prepared. In addition, County Counsel indicated that it is often too early to perform cost-benefit analyses even at six-month roundtables. If it is too early at both the initial CEP and the six-month roundtable, there is a risk that a cost-benefit analysis may never be performed. Also, because new information may change the estimated value of the case, cost-benefit analyses should be periodically updated throughout the life of a case.

Our recommendation was not based on Mr. Moscarel's report, but is based on the need to ensure cost-benefit analyses are not overlooked. Counsel's response appears to be referring to Mr. Moscarel's recommendation relating to roundtables for cases with potential costs exceeding \$500,000, where he recommends holding at least three roundtables, one in the first six months of the case, one six months prior to trial (prior to final mediation), and one two months before trial. The portion of Mr. Moscarel's report we referred to in our October 5, 2007 report states that Counsel should regularly monitor case valuation and rising legal fees in the case, and suggests that it be done every three months.

Recommendation 11 from the January 29, 2007 Report

County Counsel management clearly reemphasize that required roundtables must be held, and continuously monitor for compliance, using a RMIS exception report or another tracking system.

Current Status: SUBSTANTIALLY IMPLEMENTED

County Counsel's Response

County Counsel's response indicates that the inconsistencies we noted in the tracking spreadsheet do not indicate that the spreadsheet was an ineffective monitoring tool. The absence of dates for two TPA cases is not relevant because County Counsel says they are not responsible for tracking TPA cases. County Counsel also states that it was appropriate to leave the scheduled date for a roundtable on the spreadsheet even though the roundtable had not taken place, because a new roundtable had not yet been scheduled. County Counsel stated that the two cases we cited as requiring six-month roundtables, but for which no roundtable was held and no follow-up was indicated on the spreadsheet, were outside our sample and did not require six-month roundtables.

Auditor's Response

We reported the recommendation as Substantially Implemented because the monitoring system in place at the time of our review was not consistently used. Specifically, the spreadsheet used to monitor roundtable scheduling was not complete, nor was it used as a monitoring mechanism to ensure roundtables were actually held. The missing dates for two TPA case roundtables is an inconsistency because County Counsel records dates for both TPA and non-TPA cases on the spreadsheet. In addition, not updating the spreadsheet to indicate that a roundtable had been cancelled and needed to be rescheduled could have resulted in the roundtable being overlooked. For the case we noted, the roundtable was scheduled on April 18 and cancelled the next day. However, as of May 30, six weeks after the roundtable had been cancelled, the spreadsheet still showed the roundtable was scheduled for May 16, and there was no indication on the spreadsheet that the roundtable had been cancelled or needed to be rescheduled. According to County Counsel, they rescheduled the roundtable on May 31, which was after we brought this issue to their attention.

We reviewed a sample of 30 cases from the spreadsheet to test the adequacy of the spreadsheet as a monitoring tool, and noted two of the 30 cases appeared to have met the monetary requirement for six-month roundtables (i.e., estimated total costs to the County exceeded \$100,000) six months into the case, but no roundtable had been scheduled. For example, for one of the two cases, total in-house and outside budgeted fees and costs per the CEPs, prepared three months into the case, totaled \$120,000.

Recommendation 32 from the January 29, 2007 Report

County Counsel management immediately review all RMIS user access profiles to ensure access is restricted to each user's duties, and review all user access at least annually, whenever employees duties change, or when an employee leaves the Department.

Current Status: PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED

County Counsel's Response

County Counsel's response indicates that because they reviewed RMIS access for attorneys and their support staff, they implemented this recommendation. County Counsel also states that it appears we concluded the recommendation was only partially implemented because we added new recommendations.

In addition, County Counsel states that they are unable to comply with our new recommendation because RMIS does not provide for different dollar levels of authority for adjusting case budgets.

Auditor's Response

Our original recommendation states that County Counsel should review all RMIS user access profiles. We did not limit the recommendation to legal staff, and our conclusion that the recommendation was Partially Implemented was not related to the new recommendations, but to point out that County Counsel had not reviewed all RMIS user access profiles including financial personnel as it was intended on our original recommendation. It is apparent that County Counsel misunderstood our original recommendation. This issue can be quickly remedied by County Counsel reviewing all RMIS user access profiles including non legal staff.

We made two additional recommendations to address issues that came to our attention during our follow-up review. For example, we noted ten employees appeared to have the conflicting functions of entering and approving financial transactions. Some of these employees could also increase case budgets and issue checks. We also noted that 89 employees have authority to significantly increase case budgets. Therefore, we added a recommendation that County Counsel should review RMIS access profiles of financial personnel, ensure that adequate separation of duties is maintained, and consider limiting the number of personnel who are able to increase case budgets above a specific amount. We also recommended that County Counsel require written requests to add or update RMIS user profiles.

Although RMIS is not designed to assign differing limits for increasing budgets within one user profile, County Counsel could readily create new user profiles with differing limits. For example, County Counsel could create new user profiles such as County Counsel Update A, which would allow users to increase budgets up to \$100,000; County Counsel Update B, which would allow users to increase budgets up to \$500,000; and County Counsel Update C, which would allow users to increase budgets up to \$1 million.

With a minimum effort County Counsel could achieve an Implemented status for this recommendation.

Recommendation 34 from the January 29, 2007 Report

County Counsel management include in-house costs for supervising TPA cases in the in-house fees reported in the Quarterly Litigation Reports.

Current Status: PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED

County Counsel's Response

County Counsel states that they created new RMIS billing codes for time spent overseeing litigation, and these codes are classified as litigation and are included in the Quarterly Litigation Reports.

Auditor's Response

Through our testwork, we confirmed that in-house fees reported in the Quarterly Litigation Reports for the second and third quarters of FY 2006-07 did not include in-house fees for overseeing TPA cases. This was confirmed with the County Counsel senior manager responsible for preparing the Quarterly Litigation Reports.

County Counsel told us they are planning to require attorneys to charge time spent attending roundtables for TPA cases to a RMIS code that is reported as litigation in the Quarterly Litigation Reports. However, County Counsel had not started doing this at the time of our review.

Summary/Acknowledgement

We again recognize that County Counsel has taken a number of significant steps to implement the recommendations from our January 2007 report. The five recommendations that have not been implemented as of the time of our follow up review will require minimum effort from County Counsel to achieve an Implemented status. We will again review the status of these five recommendations within the next six months.

County Counsel's response (attached) indicates that they are confident they will be able to document full implementation of these recommendations in our next review and that they will continue their efforts until all recommendations are fully implemented.

Please call me if you have any questions, or your staff may contact Terri Kasman at (626) 293-1121.

JTM:MMO:JLS:TK

Attachment

c: William T Fujioka, Chief Executive Officer
Raymond G. Fortner, Jr., County Counsel
Rocky Armfield, County Risk Manager
Sachi A. Hamai, Executive Officer
Public Information Office
Audit Committee



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

648 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

TELEPHONE
(213) 974-1801
FACSIMILE
(213) 626-7446
TDD
(213) 633-0901

RAYMOND G. FORTNER, JR.
County Counsel

November 1, 2007

J. Tyler McCauley, Auditor-Controller
525 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

**Re: October 5, 2007 Auditor-Controller Report
County Counsel Implementation of
Litigation Management Recommendations**

Dear Mr. McCauley:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the issues with you that have arisen regarding your assessment of the extent of my office's implementation of certain recommendations as discussed in your reports of January 29, 2007, and October 5, 2007, and my response dated October 12, 2007.

From this most recent review and your report of November 1, 2007, I believe that the differences in our views regarding those items judged to be partially or substantially implemented actually consist of disagreements over the characterization of completion efforts, rather than substantive factual differences. Much relates to timing issues and the dates of the relevant field work the report speaks to. Previously I had not fully appreciated that the report speaks to a finite period in the past, and not to the present, nor that in your judgment full implementation could be reached with relatively minimum effort which may already have occurred. I am confident that we will be able to document full current implementation of these recommendations in your next review.

I appreciate the efforts our respective staffs have expended on these recommendations and their implementation. My staff and I will continue our efforts to the end that all are fully implemented, and work with your staff to bring the audit to a satisfactory close.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND G. FORTNER, JR.
County Counsel

RGF:vec



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

648 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

TELEPHONE
(213) 974-1801
FACSIMILE
(213) 626-7446
TDD
(213) 633-0901

RAYMOND G. FORTNER, JR.
County Counsel

November 1, 2007

J. Tyler McCauley, Auditor-Controller
525 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: **October 5, 2007 Auditor-Controller Report
County Counsel Implementation of
Litigation Management Recommendations**

Dear Mr. McCauley:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the issues with you that have arisen regarding your assessment of the extent of my office's implementation of certain recommendations as discussed in your reports of January 29, 2007, and October 5, 2007, and my response dated October 12, 2007.

From this most recent review and your report of November 1, 2007, I believe that the differences in our views regarding those items judged to be partially or substantially implemented actually consist of disagreements over the characterization of completion efforts, rather than substantive factual differences. Much relates to timing issues and the dates of the relevant field work the report speaks to. Previously I had not fully appreciated that the report speaks to a finite period in the past, and not to the present, nor that in your judgment full implementation could be reached with relatively minimum effort which may already have occurred. I am confident that we will be able to document full current implementation of these recommendations in your next review.

I appreciate the efforts our respective staffs have expended on these recommendations and their implementation. My staff and I will continue our efforts to the end that all are fully implemented, and work with your staff to bring the audit to a satisfactory close.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND G. FORTNER, JR.
County Counsel

RGF:vec

EXEC.4526.1



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

September 25, 2008

To: Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke, Chair
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

Raymond G. Fortner, Jr.
County Counsel

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

JOINT REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND GOALS

On October 16, 2007, on motion by Supervisor Molina, your Board instructed the Chief Executive Officer's (CEO) Risk Manager and County Counsel's Litigation Cost Manager to collaborate in preparing a joint report for the Supplemental Budget agenda, that identifies specific projects or actions accomplished during the year that supported the goal of risk management and reduction of the County's exposure to litigation. Your Board also instructed that the report identify joint goals and objectives for the subsequent year.

Attached is the joint report of 2007-08 accomplishments and 2008-09 goals and objectives for the CEO and County Counsel. We will continue to closely collaborate to achieve our mutual goals and objectives during this Fiscal Year.

In addition, County Counsel and the CEO Risk Manager will develop procedures to improve the timeliness and monitoring of the Corrective Action Plans.

If you have any questions please call us, or your staff may call Rocky A. Armfield, Risk Manager, at (213) 351-5346, or Steven H. Estabrook, Litigation Cost Manager, at (213) 974-1762.

WTF:RGF:SHE
RAA:KG:MH:km

Attachment

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

JOINT REPORT OF LITIGATION COST MANAGER AND RISK MANAGER

FISCAL YEAR 2007-2008 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During Fiscal Year 2007-2008, the Risk Management Branch of the Chief Executive Office (CEO) and County Counsel undertook several initiatives to address the County's goals of responsible Risk Management thereby reducing exposure to litigation, while concurrently strengthening litigation oversight so as to achieve the best results possible while at the same time controlling litigation costs. These actions included (1) implementation of more effective and exacting Corrective Action Plans; (2) development and implementation of a Litigation Severity Index and Management Protocol which includes a Post-Trial Analysis Protocol and periodic Client Review Meetings; (3) refinements and modifications to the Risk Management Information System (RMIS); (4) development of a RMIS User Manual and training program to maximize the use and benefit of the system; (5) implementation of Case Budgets and Billing Guidelines; and (6) implementation of an interface between RMIS and e-CAPS permitting a more streamlined and efficient method of paying claimants, attorneys and other vendors involved in the claim and litigation processes.

A. Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

County Counsel has collaborated with the CEO to strengthen the CAP process by assisting in the identification of "Priority 1" cases which require early intervention for CAP development. County Counsel has also assisted the CEO in gathering data, researching regulations, standards and policies as related to the CAP evaluation process. They have rendered legal advice and have participated in root cause analysis exercises along with assisting the CEO with the development of several CAPs during the year. This support has served to improve and strengthen the CAP process overall.

B. Litigation Severity Index and Management Protocol

During this fiscal year, County Counsel implemented the Litigation Severity Index and Management Protocols (LSI). The LSI is utilized in the management of all County litigation and deploys resources according to the magnitude of risk faced by the County. Although the LSI provides detailed management protocols for all levels of exposure, it concentrates case-management efforts on litigation which presents the most serious risks to the County.

- The Litigation Management Handbook, which serves as the primary reference source to assist and guide those members of County Counsel who either represent the County in litigated matters or oversee outside counsel in such matters, was issued. The Handbook contains the LSI protocols and sets forth, in a single document, the litigation, policies and procedures of County Counsel. The Handbook provides a comprehensive set of sample documents utilized in litigation, and contains an appendix which includes Budget & Invoice Time Guidelines.
- As part of the LSI, Client Review Meetings were also commenced in Fiscal Year 2007-2008. These meetings are conducted quarterly or more frequently as requested or necessary. The meetings provide an opportunity for County Counsel to brief the Deputies of the Board of Supervisors regarding the more serious, or Priority 1, litigated cases. These briefings include detailed presentations of selected cases, including significant recent developments and settlement recommendations regarding upcoming mediations and trials. The CEO also attends these meetings to provide the Deputies with information regarding the Department's corrective action plans.
- A continuing and always potentially significant risk of litigation is the adverse jury verdict or judicial decision. The Post-Trial Analysis Protocol was developed in conjunction with the LSI to analyze the reasons for significant adverse verdicts or judgments and to identify recommendations which can be applied to the management of existing and future litigated matters to improve their outcomes. The protocols provide criteria which trigger a review and establish a specific review process for completing the analysis and providing recommendations.
- Training sessions for County Counsel attorneys, Third Party Administrator representatives, and CEO Risk Management Branch members were conducted to familiarize them with the LSI and to ensure coordination among all disciplines involved in litigation management. The training sessions provided the participants with a variety of information regarding LSI and clarified various responsibilities ranging from the new Budget forms to reserves.
- A General Litigation Protocol Unit was established by County Counsel to monitor and ensure that the various protocols related to the LSI are followed. These protocols include the scheduling, attendance, and documentation of Roundtable meetings, the proper completion and handling of Case Evaluation Plans and Budgets, and the timely receipt of Trial Counsel Reports.
- The appropriate Change Notices to the Third Party Administrator contracts were executed in order to incorporate the requirements of the LSI into the current TPA contracts.

C. Risk Management Information System (RMIS)

Actions were taken to more fully utilize and access RMIS.

- The RMIS Quick Start Manual was developed and issued to County Counsel attorneys and other end-users of RMIS. Designed to provide a basic and more user-friendly manual, the Manual served as the source document for training and is a focused and streamlined manual for everyday use.
- All County Counsel attorneys and appropriate staff were trained in the use of RMIS. This training included accessing and inputting appropriate data on the database, as well as methods of retrieving data for use in the management of claims and litigated cases.
- A new RMIS "page," entitled the "Attorney Page," was developed to provide County Counsel attorneys with a more user-friendly and efficient means of accessing and utilizing RMIS. The Attorney Page includes, in one location on the database, all of the mandatory fields which must be completed and kept current in order to more effectively manage litigation.

D. Case Budgets & Time Guidelines

In conjunction with the LSI, Case Budget Forms, including an Appellate Budget Form, were designed and introduced for all litigated cases. Budget & Invoice Time Guidelines were also developed to assist in the formulation of budgets and the analysis of outside counsel invoices.

- The new Case Budget is a stand-alone document, separate and distinct from the Case Evaluation Plan. It is a "life-of-the-case" budget designed to project the fees and costs expected to be incurred in each phase of the litigation. The Case Budget format provides an overview of the financial expectations of each major litigation phase and provides an early and continuing cost-benefit analysis. In conformance with the LSI, Case Budgets were implemented for each priority or exposure level. The higher exposure cases require more budget detail. The new Case Budgets were incorporated into the Litigation Management Handbook and the LSI training sessions.
- A new Appellate Budget was also developed and implemented. The County is involved in a significant number of appeals. The appellate process can be a costly one. Similar to the Case Budget, the Appellate Budget is designed to project the fees and costs expected to be incurred during the various phases of the appellate process.

- To assist in establishing and managing budgets, the Budget & Invoice Time Guidelines were developed and provided to County Counsel attorneys. The Guidelines track the various stages of a litigated case and provide recommended time increments for a wide variety of attorney tasks performed by outside counsel during the course of the case. The Guidelines were also developed to assist County Counsel attorneys in reviewing outside counsel invoices. The Budget & Invoice Time Guidelines were included in the Litigation Management Handbook and the LSI training sessions.

E. RMIS/e-CAPS Interface

The need for an electronic interface between the RMIS and the County Accounting and Purchasing System (e-CAPS) has been a priority since the inception of RMIS. On April 1, 2008, an enhancement to RMIS was implemented which allowed County Counsel, CEO and Third Party Administrative staff to enter all payment transactions on a daily basis in RMIS, which is then electronically submitted to e-CAPS for processing on a nightly basis. Processed payment transactions on e-CAPS are listed in a Post Back file which updates RMIS nightly with current information regarding those payment transactions. This enhancement has resulted in cost efficiencies: reduced payment processing costs, ensured payment accuracy and enabled the County to adhere to the vendor payment time frame requirements as established by the Board.

FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009 GOALS & OBJECTIVES

During Fiscal Year 2007-2008, the Risk Management Branch of the Chief Executive Office and County Counsel, jointly and individually, accomplished several key initiatives aimed at improving risk management thereby reducing exposure to litigation while strengthening litigation oversight. In the coming fiscal year, the Risk Management Branch and County Counsel will continue to work together to build on these initiatives as well as identify and implement additional initiatives to improve the management of County risks and reduce its litigation exposure. Goals already identified for the coming year include continuing efforts to fully utilize RMIS, the identification of cause codes and case types and the tracking of liability trends, and the generation of claims and litigation reports. An additional goal is the consideration of an electronic bill review system which is compatible with RMIS and will provide a more efficient and accurate means of reviewing legal invoices. Finally, the Chief Executive Office will explore, in conjunction with the Department of Human Resources, incorporating goals aimed at risk management and litigation reduction efforts into the Management Appraisal and Performance Plan (MAPP) goals for appropriate departmental personnel.

- Develop and implement appropriate "Cause Codes" and "Case Types" for RMIS in order to identify and track the types of claims and lawsuits brought against the County. This identification process will permit necessary exposure and trend analysis.
- Assess and select an appropriate e-billing system compatible with RMIS. Such a system will provide for a more efficient, accurate and cost effective means of reviewing legal invoices.
- Develop and implement COGNOS software capable of generating a variety of claims and litigation reports which analyze the data on RMIS.
- Develop Management Appraisal and Performance Plan (MAPP) goals for departmental personnel which promote the recognition of efforts and actions to further risk management and reduce exposure to litigation.